

**DARWINISM**  
**OR**  
**IS MAN A DEVELOPED**  
**MONKEY?**

**By**  
**W. B. RILEY, D. D.**  
**Minneapolis, Minn.**

---

All rights reserved by the Author.

## OTHER BOOKS BY THE AUTHOR.

---

"The Crisis of the Church"	
200 pp., cloth bound, postpaid....	\$1.00
"The Evolution of the Kingdom"	
(A full discussion of the Second Coming) 189 pp., cloth.....	.75
"Messages for the Metropolis"	
220 pp., cloth.....	.75
"The Finality of the Higher Criticism"	
220 pp., paper cover.....	.40
"Old Testament Types"	
173 pp., paper cover.....	.40
"The Coming and Kingdom"	
130 pp., paper cover.....	.25
"The Seven Churches of Asia"	
130 pp., paper cover.....	.25
"The Gospel in Jonah"	
130 pp., paper cover.....	.25
"The Return and the Resurrection"	.10
"Household Religion"; tract—four sermons . . . . .	.10
"Christian Science & Divine Healing" . . . . .	.10
"Socialism vs. Christianity".....	.05
"Growth in Grace".....	.05
"What of the Dead?".....	.05

## DARWINISM OR IS MAN A DEVELOPED MONKEY?

By  
W. B. RILEY, D. D.  
Minneapolis, Minn.

---

All rights reserved by the Author.

# IS MAN A DEVELOPED MONKEY?

OR

## THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION AND FALSE THEOLOGY

---

A chapter from the volume, "The Theory of Evolution and False Theology," by W. B. Riley, D.D., Pastor First Baptist Church, Minneapolis, Minn.

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. . . . And God said, Let the waters under the heavens be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so. . . . And God said, Let the earth put forth grass, herbs yielding seed, and fruit-trees bearing fruit after their kind, wherein is the seed thereof, upon the earth: and it was so. . . . And God said, Let the waters swarm with swarms of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven. And God created the great sea-monsters, and every living creature that moveth, wherewith the waters swarmed, after their kind, and every winged bird after its kind; and God saw that it was good . . . . And God said, Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind, cattle, and creeping things, and beasts of the earth, after their kind: and it was so. . . . And God said Let us make

man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have the dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." Gen. 1:1, 9, 11, 20-21, 24, 26-27.

"By faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which appear." Heb. 11:3.

Our theme is "The Theory of Evolution and Theology." It may not have occurred to all that the theory of evolution and theology are indissolubly linked together. But every scientist understands, as do also intelligent teachers of the Scriptures, that the theory of evolution is not simply a question of the origin of species; but, in its present-day application, proposes to account for everything material, from fire-mist to the perfected frame of the universe; everything animated, from the fertilized cell of lowest life to the Man of Nazareth; and everything moral, from the sensation of an amoeba to the sacred communion between God and man.

When, therefore, a biologist says that the minister has nothing to do with the theory of evolution, he reveals either his ignorance of its applications or his indisposition to be disturbed by an adequate argument. When a professor in Natural Science says that people who are not constant students of his specialty should not pass any judgement upon

its claims and contentions, he disputes the right of decision by a competent jury, and demands that the public close its eyes, that it may the more readily swallow his deliverances.

It may be necessary, therefore, for the man who decides to think for himself, and even maintain his right to judge the findings of so-called scientists, to "beg pardon"; but this formality performed, we pass on to question, compare, and conclude according to the individual judgement.

Every preacher of the present hour is compelled to deal with the theory of evolution, and either accept it or reject it. Its advocates have invaded his realm. Prof. Metcalf, biologist of the Woman's College, Baltimore, in his book "Organic Evolution" naively tells us that in coming to the position of a dignified science the last stronghold to be taken by evolution was that of the supernaturalist, "that of the man who claims that supernatural agency intervenes in nature in such a way as to modify the natural law of events." This opinion he thinks Darwin overthrew and doomed. (See "Introduction of Organic Evolution," p. 20.)

Such a suggestion clearly indicates that the entire company of conservative theologians are not only unscientific, but are mental mossbacks, clinging to exploded theories, preaching obsolete opinions and practicing doctrines long since out of date. If, therefore, one of them should fail to make an argument, the public ought not to be surprised. On the other hand, if he should succeed in

making the theory of evolution look doubtful, it might be worth while for the public to examine carefully the foundations of this much boasted philosophy.

At the risk of revealing our weakness in argument, we propose three statements concerning evolution. First, The Theory is Unscientific; second, the Theory is Unscriptural; third, the Theory is Anti-Christian.

### THE THEORY IS UNSCIENTIFIC

*It is suggestion, not a science.* The prevailing opinion that evolution is a modern scientific discovery is false alike to history and to the proper employment of speech. On the authority of Wallace, Lucretius, who lived a hundred years before Christ, in his great poem on "The Nature of Things," expressed the major part of the present-day theory. He held to the molecular belief, that the molecules did not come into actual contact; defined atoms, thought that they were eternal; while admitting the existence of gods, he refused them any share in the construction of the universe, maintaining that it had come by chance, after infinite time, by random motions and collisions, and he tried to account for the introduction of sensation into atoms. He maintained that earth worms came by spontaneous generation, and that in some remote period of the world's history, when heat and moisture abounded, the earth was filled with wombs, out of which were born living things, and after the custom of many a

present-day biologist, he contended that the very ground had given existence alike to the lowest forms of life, to every beast and to man.

To be sure, the modern apostles of this faith—Huxley, Darwin, Spencer, Wallace and others, have found for it more attractive phrases, argued it on the ground of likelihood, progression and analogy; but not one of these ever called it a science. They regarded it a theory, and a new theory.

It is not unusual for the smaller followers of great minds to far exceed their masters. The leading evolutionists of the world today do not speak of it as a "science"; they retain the old term of Huxley, Darwin, and Spencer—"theory." But many a preacher who is neither a specialist in Natural History nor in Supernatural Revelation, finds himself involved in what he regards "the conflict between science and theology" and attempts the reconciliation. Since the path by which Science has traveled is strewn with the decaying structures of discarded theories, why should not Andrew White have withheld his endeavor until specialists in biology, geology and paleontology are themselves convinced that evolution is something more than a theory?

Several times in recent years we have questioned fairly competent exponents of this theory as to whether they regarded it a "science," to be answered in almost every instance, "Well, it is generally adopted, the world over, as a working theory for scientific investigation." Now the Standard Dictionary defines "theory" after this manner—"A plan, or scheme subsisting in the mind, but based on

principles variable by observation; loosely and popularly, were hypothesis or speculation; hence an individual view." "Science," on the contrary, it describes as "Knowledge gained and verified by exact observation and correct thinking." A theory may be scientific; but to make it such one must produce its verification by exact observation or experiment, whereupon it is no longer a theory. Neither Darwin, Huxley, nor Spencer ever maintained that they had produced such verification of evolution!

But we go a step farther. *The theory of evolution is unproven and unprovable.* Notwithstanding Darwin's "Origin of Species," in the form of a book, the occurrence of a new species, either by natural selection or human cultivation, is unknown. By cultivation man has made the rose more splendid in size, more beautiful and variegated in color, and not a few of the flowers he has even doubled; but no man has yet produced a rose from the seed of sunflower, nor from the pink, nor from anything else than a rose; or even been able to make a grain of rye, similar as it is to the form of other cereals, bring forth oats or wheat, or else than rye. A line from Genesis is the law of natural history, "Every seed after its own kind." The scientists of the world have wrought assiduously to disprove this statement of Holy Scripture; but their endeavors to overthrow the Divine fiat have signally failed.

When a biologist who believes that all life, from an amoeba to a Milton, is the product of evolution, being asked if such a thing as a new species, by natural selection is known, answers, "We think there are some snails in the Hawaiian

Islands that hint at it," he will not blame us if we regard his investigations a little "slow." Or, if he affirms that the gill slits of a human foetus prove that man has ascended from sea life, we answer, "That sounds fishy." If he point to the mule in defense of his doctrines, we remind him of its sterility, and make his argument asinine. Not a few scientists have said, concerning the mule, that with his accustomed stubbornness he "blocks the way of the evolution theory." But better still is the remark of Dr. A. J. Frost that "the mule is the endeavor of an ass to evolute himself, but he only succeeds in making a bigger ass of himself."

The utter desperation to which evolutionists are driven in their desire to "demonstrate"—as the Christian (?) Scientist (?) says—and so be able to switch from theory to science, is shown in their treatment of the horse. They have dug out of the earth a little animal about the size of a fox, with five toes, which has some similarity to the horse, and they have called him—old horse-eohippus; and they have brought up another with three toes, as big as a timber wolf, and because of certain similarities they have called him a horse; and then they have imagined that horse finally developing into the present beautiful beast of domestic service, with one toe elongated from the knee to the hoof; and in certain splints on the side of his leg they find the aborted toes. The intervening horses, bridging the gap between these ancient animals and our black beauty, they have sought in vain! Yet they will stand before you and speak with all the assurance of men who had found the last

missing link, concerning the evolution of the horse! Why do they begin with that little fox-like animal? In the ocean there is a shrimp that has the head of a horse and his motions in water are much like a plunging charger. Why not begin with him? At college the boys used to be chargeable with having ridden a pony, and if it could be proven it was worse for them when they came into the professor's presence. Once a cute lad, who was later a consul in one of the South American Republics, bluntly remarked in the presence of our professor, "I had a pony last season that thirteen rode; but I gave him away because this present class has nineteen big fellows in it, and I thought it would be an outrage for us all to straddle the little fellow!" But that poor pony of the five toes has been straddled by a thousand professors; they have ridden the toes off him, and it is little wonder that some of their students have gone out to pity the pony and regard the professors' conduct with ridicule.

Something similar has occurred in the attempt to make a man out of a monkey. They found the missing link once in "The Calaveras Skull." It was 150 feet below surface. There could be no doubt about it! But when Wm. R. C. Scribner confessed that he had brought it into the mine as a practical joke, scientists were ashamed. Dr. W. J. Sinclair's discussion, "Recent Investigations Bearing on the Question of the Occurrence of Neocene Man in the Auriferous Gravels of the Sierra Nevada" confirms Scribner's claim, and makes it perfectly evident that Prof. J. D. Whitney paraded a very modern skull as that of a prehistoric man.

They found the missing link in the Neanderthal skeleton in Prussia, and proclaimed it three hundred thousand years old; but it turned out to be only a Cossack killed in 1814. Columbia College had a smart professor who dug out of Colorado's soil a skeleton. It was heralded as of remarkable antiquity, and the friable bones were being paraded to the ends of the earth when some cowboys complained that the grave of their pet monkey had been rifled. To be sure, the greatest ado has been made over the *Pithecanthropus Erectus*. It consists of the piece of a skull and leg bone and two teeth, found in Java, in 1891. Dr. Alexander Patterson says the cubic measurement of that skull is sixty inches—the same as that of an idiot. These specimens were found at separate places and times. The skull is too small for the thigh bone. The age of the strata in which they were found is uncertain. Even Haeckel admits that the belief that this is the missing link is strongly combated by some distinguished scientists.

The earth has been opened at a thousand points; the sea has been explored to its bottom; biologists have had access to the very bowels of both and have been animated by one determination—the discovery of the missing link—and yet to the present hour they have utterly failed to produce it! We fear that it is an illustration of what the Irishman said. He attended the circus and was especially interested in the dromedary. He examined the ungainly beast from head to foot; felt of the great humps to see whether they were artificial or actual flesh. Being convinced of the latter, he said, "Begory, they ain't no sich animal!"

This seems to be the truth concerning the missing link. It is one thing to imagine that it exists; it is another to make the demonstrations, and science demands the latter.

*Its conclusions are without premises.* What evidence is there that the universe began in fire-mist? What evidence is there that life originated out of death? What evidence is there that mineral became the vegetable, and vegetable became the animal, and the animal became the man? What proof have we of the eternity of matter beyond the atheistic desire to have it so? And if these premises are false, how can conclusions resting upon them be true. If within the knowledge of man the reptile has never become a bird, a fish has never become a mammal, a monkey has never become a man; if the depths of the earth and the sounding of the seas refuse to deliver up a single instance of such a metamorphosis, what are the premises of this argument?

It may be very convenient to push claims back to the time where the knowledge of man utterly fails, but do not do violence to the splendid attainments of human speech by calling such conduct "scientific." I may have no right to object to Mr. Darwin's believing that "man is descended from a hairy quadruped, furnished with a tail, and pointed ears; probably arboreal in its habits, and an inhabitant of the Old World," but I can not be denied the right to ask him to produce some evidence of his assertion. Dr. Eldridge, of the British Museum, declares that that institution is filled with specimens, every one of which disproves the evolution theory. Dr.

Joseph Clark, after spending twenty-nine years in the heart of Africa, said: "I find no evidence of evolution in Africa, but positive proofs to the contrary."

*The greatest Scientists are now saying the theory is unscientific.* The reading of Prof. L. T. Townsend's "Collapse of Evolution" brings abundant proof of this assertion. This statement applies not only to the Darwinian theory of Evolution, but equally to all the improved and patented types of this general hypothesis.

Dr. N. S. Shaler, Professor of Geology in Harvard, is quoted: "It begins to be evident to Naturalists that the Darwinian hypothesis is still essentially unverified. . . . It is not yet proved that a single species of the two or three millions now inhabiting the earth, had been established solely or mainly by the operation of Natural Selection."

Professor C. C. Everett, also of Harvard, speaking of evolution, says: "If, in the past, those ranks of beings ever rose and moved in procession along the upward slope, each passing, by no matter how slow a step, out of its own limitations, and in itself, or in its posterity entered upon a larger life, it was before the eyes of man were opened to them. No searching of his awakened powers can detect, even among the remains of an unknown antiquity, any glimpse of the great movement while in progress of accomplishment. All, as he looks upon it, is as fixed as the sphinx, that slumbers on the Egyptian sands. All this story of transformation and activity is a dream."

Professor Lionel S. Beale, physiologist, and professor of anatomy and pathology in King's College, London, in his special field, that of biology, is, with one exception, perhaps, without a peer in any country of the world. While addressing the Victoria Institute of London, he said: "The idea of any relation having been established between the non-living and living, by a gradual advance from lifeless matter to the lowest forms of life and so onwards to the higher and more complex, has not the slightest evidence from the facts of any section of living nature of which anything is known."

Prof. Virchow of Berlin, the greatest German authority in physiology, and "the foremost chemist on the globe," at one time a pronounced advocate of Darwin's and Haeckel's views, subsequently, in his famous lecture on "Freedom of Science," while speaking of evolution, made this statement: "It is all nonsense. It cannot be proved by science that man descends from the ape or from any other animal. Since the announcement of the theory, all real scientific knowledge has proceeded in the opposite direction."

In a recent number of *Beweis des glaubens*, Professor Zoeckler, of the University of Greifswald, employs these words: "The claim that the hypothesis of descent is secured scientifically must most decidedly be denied."

Professor Fleischmann, of Erlangen, one of the several recent converts to anti-Darwinism, in a book published in Leipsic, "Die Darwin's che Theorie," reaches this conclusion: "The Darwinian

theory of descent has in the realms of nature not a single fact to confirm it. It is not the result of scientific research, but purely the product of the imagination."

The most suggestive words, however, and really the severest criticism on evolution, though not spoken with that intent, are from Professor Ernst Haeckel, of Jena, Germany's greatest biologist, and the rankest naturalistic evolutionist of recent date. In his latest utterances he bewails the fact that he is standing almost alone. "Most modern investigators of science have come to the conclusion," he says, "that the doctrine of evolution and particularly Darwinism is an error and cannot be maintained." Then he enumerates several distinguished men, whom he calls "bold and talented scientists," who, not long since were advocates of evolution, but who lately have abandoned it. The men he mentions are Dr. E. Dennert, author of *Vom Sterbelager des Darwinismus* (1903); Dr. Goette, the Strasburg professor, Prof. Edward Hoppe, known as "the Hamburg Savant," who in his recent pamphlets takes a pronounced position, in the name of religion, against naturalistic evolution; Professor Paulson, of Berlin, who, among his other criticisms of evolution, has recently declared that Haeckel's theory "is a disgrace to the philosophy of Germany"; Professor Rutemeyer, geologist and paleontologist, of Basel, who charges evolutionists, especially of the Haeckel type, with "playing false with the public, and with the natural sciences," and Professor Wilhelm Max Wundt, of Leipsic.

The amazing thing, is, as Professor Townsend remarks, the utter dishonesty of those American professors, and ignorance of those American Preachers, who, on occasion, and oft, without occasion, assure audiences that all great Scientists are evolutionists.

Such speakers have come to use the term "Science" almost as loosely as the followers of Mary Baker Eddy do!

### THE THEORY IS UNSCRIPTURAL

*The Word nowhere warrants it.* There are brethren in the pulpit who have a new way of interpreting the first chapter of Genesis, which, by the way, one of my fellow-laborers has translated after the following manner:

1. Primarily the unknowable moved upon cosmos and evolved protoplasm.

2. And, protoplasm was inorganic and undifferentiated; containing all things in potential energy; and a spirit of evolution moved upon the fluid mass.

3. And the Unknowable said, Let atoms attract; and their contact begat light, heat and electricity.

4. And the Unconditioned differentiated the atoms each after its kind; and their combination begat rock, air and water.

5. And there went out a spirit of Evolution from the Unconditioned, and working in protoplasm by accretion and absorption produced the organic cell.

6. And cell by nutrition evolved primordial germ, and germ developed protogene; and protogene begat eozoon, and eozoon begat monad, and monad begat animalculae.

7. And animalculae begat ephemra; then began creeping things to multiply on the face of the earth.

8. And earthly atom in protoplasm begat molecule, and thence came grass and every herb of the earth.

9. And animalculae in the water evolved fins, tails, claws and scales; and in the air wings and beaks; and on the land they sprouted such organs as were necessary as played upon by the environment.

10. And by accretion and absorption, came the radiata and mollusca, and mollusca begat articulata, and articulata begat vertebrate.

11. Now these are the generations of the higher vertebrata in the cosmic period that the Unknowable evolved the biped mammalia:

12. And every man of the earth, while he was yet a monkey, and the horse, while he was yet the hipparion, and the hipparion before he was an oreodon. Out of the ascidian came the amphibian and begat the pentadactyle, and by inheritance and selection, produced the hylobate, from which are the simiade in all their tribes.

13. And out of the simiade the lemur prevailed above his fellow and produced the platyrhine monkey.

14. And the polatyrrhine begat the catarrhine, and the catarrhine begat the anthropoid ape and the ape begat the longimanous orang, and the orang begat the chimpanzee, and the chimpanzee evolved the what-is-it?

15. And the what-is-it? went into the land of Nod, and took him a wife of the longimanous gibbons.

16. And in the process of the cosmic period were born unto them their children the anthromorphic premordial types.

17. The homunculus, the prognathus; the troglodyte, and the autochthon, the terragon,—these are the generations of primeval man.

18. And primeval man was naked and not ashamed, but lived in quadrumanous innocence, and struggled mightily to harmonize with the environment.

19. And by inheritance and natural selection did he progress from the stable and homogeneous to the complex and the heterogeneous; for the weakest died, and the strongest grew and multiplied.

20. And man grew a thumb for that he had need of, and developed capacities for prey.

21. For behold, the swiftest animals got away from the slow men, wherefore the slow animals were eaten and the slow men starved to death.

22. And as the types differentiated the weaker types continually disappeared.

23. And the earth was filled with violence; for man strove with man, and tribe with tribe, whereby they killed off the weak and foolish and secured "the survival of the fittest."

Moses again appeals to the public, "Choose you this day which you will have"—what the Spirit saith, or what the self-styled Scientist asserteth!

*At many points evolution is anti-scriptural.* The majority of evolutionists, certainly the most able ones among them, contend for the eternity of matter. The Scriptures assert the opposite. "By faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the Word of God; so that which is seen hath not been made out of things which appeared." (Heb. 11:3.)

Almost to a man, evolutionists contend that species are the product of natural selection. Ten times in the first chapter of Genesis the law "after its own kind" is declared, and it covers every form of life, from the blade of grass to the god-like occupants of Eden. It is little wonder, therefore, that when such men as Crawford H. Toy, George Burman Foster, B. Fay Mills, Charles Aked and R. J. Campbell adopt the evolution theory *in toto*, they immediately begin to treat the Word of God as though it were without authority. And it is hardly to be wondered at that Prof. Haeckel, the most noted evolutionist, should proceed, in his "Riddles of the Universe" to read God out of it altogether. However, there is one thing to be said in favor of these men. They are intelligent enough to see the inharmony between the Scriptures and this present-day popular theory; and

honest enough to say, "We prefer evolution to the Book." It is easier to hold such men in esteem than it is to respect those who go up and down the land telling us that evolution is true, and so is the Bible. Such teachers seem to belong with the boy Dr. John Henry Barrows is reported to have met in India. "A native lad had attended the Christian schools and learned there the shape and situation of the earth, but in his Hindoo home he had been taught the Hindoo cosmogony, namely, that the earth was circled by salt water, and that by a circle of earth, and these by successive circles of sweet cane juice and other soft drinks, with intervening circles of land. Dr. Barrows asked the boy which belief he would hereafter hold. He replied that he would believe both.

## THE THEORY AND FALSE THEOLOGY

The intimate relation between this theory and theology is becoming more and more apparent. It is doubtful if there is a single skeptical professor or preacher in the Old World or the New, who is not also a fairly full-fledged evolutionist. The theological result is perfectly evident in such books as "The Finality of the Christian Religion" and the "New Theology."

According to evolutionists, *God is a force*, and those ministers who have accepted the evolutionary theory of the natural universe, have lost their personal heavenly Father in consequence. The shibboleth of such professed Christian preachers is one with that of the atheis-

tic philosophers when they have found a common viewpoint in evolution. It is a remarkable fact to find Daniel, when he comes to describe the coming Prince who shall oppose God, and magnify himself beyond all, literally saying, "But in his estate he shall honor the god of force." (Dan. 11:38.) Are our Critics the forerunners of the anti-Christ?

*Evolution makes Christ only a remarkable man.* One calls Him "the only man"; another believes that He was the "mental product of excessive admiration." "The Flower of the Race" is so beautiful an expression, that quite a few of them agree in its adoption. But, whatever the expression, essential deity is never intended, and to admit that He was begotten by the Holy Ghost would introduce supernaturalism, which they repudiate. Prof. Foster's astonishment that "belief in the virgin birth of Jesus should ever have been held as a cardinal article of the Christian faith" is shared by a majority of the Darwinians.

*Christ's resurrection from the dead* is either denied outright or else explained away by affirming that it was not physical. His promise to come again at the end of the Age and introduce a millennium wherein He himself shall "reign from sea to sea and from the rivers to the ends of the earth" they repudiate to a man, and so fulfill the prediction of Peter, "In the last days mockers shall come, walking after their own lusts and saying, Where is the promise of his coming; for from the day that the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation."

*This theory makes sin essentially a virtue.* Man is not a fallen creature. One of their best exponents, a good representative of a great university, recently affirmed that "to tell children they were not 'by nature' children of God, was irrational; to instruct them that the essential thing was the evolution of the life within them, was sanity." To such teachers "sin" is not "a transgression of the law of God," but simply false strokes in the struggle to be free from self-limitations and opposing environments. While compelled to admit that a crab-apple will never produce pippins unless the latter be grafted in, they yet insist that the child, which the Scripture declares is "conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity," can become a saint without "the grafting in" of the new nature, or the regenerating work of the Holy Ghost. To them, Paul's description of sin as "exceedingly sinful" is without justification, and the prophet's statement, "The soul that sinneth it shall die" should be changed to "The soul that sinneth is searching after life."

To be sure some of the greater minds among them do not go to these lengths. Henry Drummond held to the necessity of the new birth, but for that matter, Drummond's "Natural Law in the Spiritual World" is the very antithesis of the full fledged evolution theory.

*The resurrection is even more offensive* to evolutionists, than is regeneration. It just as certainly introduces the supernatural, and it brings the work of the Spirit before the natural vision where men can see and judge for themselves His appearance to "above five hundred

brethren at once" (1 Cor. 15:6) is boldly disputed, and the explanation of their testimony is found in the fervor with which these deluded disciples loved their leader.

*It makes the cross only a criminal mistake.* From their viewpoint it was not according to prophecy, nor did it in any wise profit the race. It was only a notable one among the many instances where men, actuated by human hatred and selfishness, have ignorantly slain their friend. As a rule, they scoff the notion that "He bore our sins on the tree," and will have none of the teaching that "by the shedding of His blood" we have secured our "remission." Christ crucified, is unto these, as to the Jews of old, "a stumbling block," and as unto the Gentiles of former times, "foolishness."

*To them redemption is a misleading term.* The thought of God's buying back, with His precious blood, that which man had forfeited to the Adversary is little better than a jest. "Salvation must be by self-development" they insist! Paul, when he dares to say, "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves," is simply mistaken.

What then, is the conclusion of the whole matter? Some writer has summed it up after this manner: "A pantheistic god, instead of a personal God. A human Saviour instead of a divine Saviour. Infallible scholarship instead of an infallible Bible. Reformation instead of regeneration. Culture instead of conversion. The natural in all things, the supernatural in nothing." These are the results of modern scholarship! Cer-

tainly, as Dr. A. H. Strong, Ex-President of Rochester Seminary says, "We need a new vision of the Saviour to convince us that Jesus is lifted above space and time, that His existence antedated creation, that He conducted the march of Hebrew history, that He was born of a virgin, suffered on the cross, rose from the dead, and now lives forever more, the Lord of the universe, the only God with whom we have to do, our Saviour here and our Judge hereafter. Without a revival of this faith our churches become secularized; mission enterprises will die out and the candlestick will be removed out of its place, as it was in the seven churches of Asia, and as it has been with the apostate churches of New England."

